

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-19 are pending. No claim has been amended, canceled, or added.

Claims 1 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to make and use the invention. Applicants respectfully traverse the application. Fig. 2 illustrates the first and second memories according to one embodiment of the invention. In this embodiment, the bitmap 34 is the first memory, and the bitmap 32 is the second memory. Support for the first and second memories are also found on page 3, lines 16-23.

The Examiner also indicated that there is a lack of support for a video driver operable "to compare said first and second memories to determine whether or not a first portion of an image displayed on said second monitor is to be modified..." Applicants respectfully note that the support for the above features are found at least on page 3, lines 16-23 and page 4, lines 15-20.

Claims 1-6, 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 is directed to a monitor system having a first monitor connected to said host computer and a second monitor, separate and unattached to said first monitor and smaller than said first monitor. The claim recites, "...a first memory configured to store image information transmitted to said second monitor; a second memory configured to store image information to be transmitted to said second monitor; and a video driver in said host computer for providing a portion of a display on said first monitor to said second monitor, said video driver being operable to compare said first and second memories to determine whether or not a first portion of an image displayed on said second monitor is to be modified and a second portion of said image displayed on said second monitor is to be left unmodified, wherein image data corresponding to said first portion of said image are transmitted to said second monitor and image data corresponding to said second portion of said image are not transmitted to said second monitor."

Lee discloses a computer system with two monitors. However, it does not disclose "a first memory configured to store image information transmitted to said second monitor" and "a second memory configured to store image information to be transmitted to said second monitor." The Examiner's position is that the above features are not supported and Lee discloses a first memory and a second memory (Response to Arguments, numeral 10). As pointed out above, the above recited features relating to the first and second memories are supported by the specification.

The Examiner was silent as to the features associated with the first and second memories. Applicants note that Lee does not disclose these features. Lee also does not disclose, "...a video driver in said host computer for providing a portion of a display on said first monitor to said second monitor, said video driver being operable to compare said first and second memories to determine whether or not a first portion of an image displayed on said second monitor is to be modified and a second portion of said image displayed on said second monitor is to be left unmodified, wherein image data corresponding to said first portion of said image are transmitted to said second monitor and image data corresponding to said second portion of said image are not transmitted to said second monitor." Therefore, claim 1 is allowable.

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Claim 10 depends from claim 1 and is allowable at least for this reason.

Claims 11-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Grossman et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. These claims depend from claim 1 and are allowable at least for this reason.

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Craig. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Claim 7 depends from claim 1 and is allowable at least for this reason.

Claims 15-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Grossman and further in view of Craig. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 15 is directed to a monitor system. The claim recites, "...a second monitor, smaller than said first monitor, connected to said shared peripheral bus, said second monitor including a display screen on said second monitor of less than 8.5 inches diagonally; a display controller connected to said display screen, a video memory connected to said display controller, a bus interface connected to said video memory, and a power input connected to said bus so that the power for said second monitor is derived from said shared peripheral bus; a compression unit in said host computer for compressing said portion of said display for transmission to said second monitor; a video driver in said host computer for providing a separate window of a display to said second monitor and not to said first monitor."

Lee does not disclose "...a second monitor, smaller than said first monitor, connected to said shared peripheral bus..." A shared peripheral bus generally has a limited bandwidth since it may be shared with a plurality of peripheral devices. Accordingly, "a compression unit" is used in the claimed invention to compress "said portion of said display for transmission to said second monitor." Otherwise, the data needed for displaying information or images on the second monitor may not be effectively transmitted over the shared peripheral bus.

The Examiner noted that Lee does not disclose the "compression unit." Lee presumably does not disclose the "compression unit" because it does not use a shared peripheral bus to connect the second monitor the host computer. Neither Grossman nor Craig remedies the above deficiencies of Lee.

Lee does not disclose the "compression unit." Although Craig may disclose an MPEG encoder, it does not provide motivation for providing the MPEG encoder to the system disclosed in Lee. Therefore, claim 15 is allowable.

Claim 18 recites, "a second display screen for connection to a host computer having a first display screen, said second display screen being separate and unattached to said first display screen and smaller than said first display screen, said second display screen comprising: a display controller coupled to said second display screen; a video memory coupled to said display controller; a bus interface, coupled to said video memory, for providing an

Appl. No. 09/640,168
Amdt. dated July 7, 2003
Amendment under 37 CFR 1.116 Expedited
Procedure Examining Group

PATENT

interface with a shared peripheral bus; and a power input connected to said bus so that the power for said second display screen is derived from said shared peripheral bus."

Lee does not disclose "...said second display screen comprising...a bus interface, coupled to said video memory, for providing an interface with a shared peripheral bus..." and "...a power input connected to said bus so that the power for said second display screen is derived from said shared peripheral bus." Neither Grossman nor Craig remedies the above deficiencies of Lee. Claim 18 is allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is urged.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,



Steve Y. Cho
Reg. No. 44,612

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, 8th Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
SYC:syc
PA 3316538 v1